

REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are pending. Claims 1-44 stand rejected. Claims 8, 10, 16, 20, 25, and 41-43 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 45 and 46 have been added.

Drawings

The drawings stand objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters "210" and "200" have both been used to designate the web browser software. Figure 2 has been amended to distinguish the browser software 200 and web page 210. Support for the amendment includes page 2, ln. 29 through page 3, ln. 5 of the present application. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added.

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure stands objected to because "quickly, an reused." is informal. The abstract has been amended to state in relevant part "quickly and reused."

Page 3, ln. 23 of the disclosure stands objected to because "quickly, an reused." is informal. The disclosure has been amended to state in relevant part "quickly and reused."

Page 4, ln. 13 of the disclosure stands objected to. The paragraph containing the text on page 4, ln. 13 has been wholly replaced to track the language of currently amended claim 29.

Withdrawal of the objections is requested.

The paragraph beginning on p. 3, ln. 24 has been replaced with a paragraph tracking new claim 45.

No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

Claim 22 is objected to because “is includes” is repetitive. Claim 22 has been amended to delete “is”.

Claim 21 is objected to because “operable perform” is informal. Claim 21 has been amended to recited “operable to perform”.

Withdrawal of the objections is requested.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 18, 23, 26 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim 18 stands rejected because “options” is vague and indistinct. Claim 18 has been amended to recite “one or more parameters selected by a user include configuration options selections”.

Claim 23 stands rejected because “The application”, line 2, is not clearly referring to which application specifically. “The application” has been deleted in claim 23.

Claim 26 stands rejected for lack of antecedent basis for “the client computer system”. Claim 26 has been amended to depend from claim 45, which provides proper antecedent basis for “client computing systems”.

Claim 34 stands rejected because the terminology “and causing the computing presentation information is vague and does not appear complete. Claim 34 has been amended to delete “causing the” and to recite in relevant part “monitoring for a file not found error, and computing the presentation information when a file not found error occurs.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-13, 16-31, 33, 36-41 and 43-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,038,601 issued to Lambert et al. (hereinafter “*Lambert*”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Note: claim 1 now depends from new independent claim 45. Also, note that the claims have been amended to clarify a focus of the invention rather than overcoming particular rejections.

Lambert teaches improved “use of the Web and wide-area networks by managing groups of network objects (content or applications) and bringing that content and notifications from servers directly to desktops in a timely fashion and while consuming a minimal amount of desktop screen space.” *Lambert*, col. 4, lns. 13-18. *Lambert* further discloses that “an intelligent caching infrastructure that uses information (called “Meta-Data”) about the content to control client and intermediate caches reduces the wide-area networking problems generally attributed to interactive content by allowing the caches to manage expiration, compaction, bulk-delivery and other operations guided via Meta-Data from the content provider.” *Lambert*, col. 4, lns. 47-53.

More specifically, *Lambert* teaches that “meta-data” is used to configure much of the behavior of caching servers.” *Lambert*, col. 11, lns. 6-7. *Lambert* continues by stating that “The meta-data is stored in HTML tags and can therefore appear anywhere in a site.” *id.*

However, *Lambert* neither teaches nor suggests a “system that facilitates reusability of dynamically generated electronic files” as recited in new independent claim 45. “Traditional web page caching systems are ineffective when the web page content is dynamic.” Present application, p. 3, lns. 4-5. The invention of claim 45 provides a solution neither taught nor suggested by *Lambert* that includes “dynamically generated electronic files stored in a storage medium, each dynamically generated electronic file includes an identifier that is derived from dynamically generated presentation information stored in the file” as recited by new independent claim 45.

Furthermore, *Lambert* neither teaches nor suggests “a computer readable representation received by the system from a client computing system, the computer readable representation having a presentation state signature based on a presentation state defined, at least in part, by one or more parameters selected by a user interacting with a file displayed by the client computing system that are useful to identify one of the dynamically generated electronic files in which stored presentation information is associated with the presentation state upon which the signature is based” as recited by claim 45.

Lambert also neither teaches nor suggests “[a] method of caching and retrieving cached dynamically generated files” as recited by amended claim 29. *Lambert* teaches that “Web browser 100 then sends an HTTP request to a remote caching server 204[, and in] response, caching server 204 either retrieves cached content from cache 300 or sends an HTTP request via the Internet” as cited by the Examiner. *Lambert* col. 5, lns. 55-60 *Lambert* also teaches “Lookahead prefetch of content based on local algorithms and on custom control information from back-end servers” and other caching server functions as cited by the Examiner. *Lambert* col. 6, lns. 25-38. However, *Lambert* fails to teach or suggest “a file request that includes information based on selections of a user interacting with a web page ... and determining whether the file request identifies one of the cached dynamically generated files” as recited in claims 29 and 46. Furthermore, *Lambert* neither teaches nor suggests “saving the computed presentation information in a file in the cache, thus creating a dynamically generated file, and transmitting the dynamically generated file to the at least one client computer system” as recited by claims 29 and 46.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 29, 45, and 46 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein. Additionally, claims dependent from independent claims 29, 45, and 46 are, thus, allowable for at least the same reasons as the claims from which they depend. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 34-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,038,601 issued to Lambert et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,006,264 issued to Colby et al. (hereinafter “*Colby*”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Colby generally relates to a “Method and system for directing a flow between a client and a server.” *Colby* title. *Colby* teaches “that an HTTP 404 error in response to a request for the requested content” indicates that a server “no longer contains the requested content”. *Colby* col. 12, lns. 6-13. However, neither *Lambert* nor *Colby*, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the invention of claim 29, from which claims 34 and 35 depend. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least this reason, claims 34 and 35 are allowable over *Lambert* in view of *Colby*. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 14-15, 32 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,038,601 issued to Lambert et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,358 issued to Mattis et al. (hereinafter "*Mattis*"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Note claim 42 has been cancelled because of the amendment to claim 38 to create a dependent claim and the resulting close similarity between claims 32 and 42.

Mattis teaches a method "for caching and delivering an alternate version from among a plurality of alternate version of information objects." *Mattis*, abstract, first sentence. *Mattis* continues stating that "One or more alternate versions of an information object, for example, versions of the information object that are prepared in different language or compatible with different systems, are stored in an object cache database." *Mattis*, abstract, second sentence.

However, neither *Lambert* nor *Mattis*, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the invention of claim 45 and 29, from which claims 14, 15, and 32 depend. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least this reason, claims 34 and 35 are allowable over *Lambert* in view of *Mattis*. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, Washington, D.C. 20231, on February 18, 2003.



Attorney for Applicant(s)

2-18-2003

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Kent B. Chambers
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38,839